

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 JAMES EDWARD SCOTT, III,
4 Plaintiff,
5 v.
6 CYNTHIA GREEN,
7 Defendant.

Case No. 3:24-cv-00347-ART-CSD
DISMISSAL ORDER

8 Plaintiff James Edward Scott III brings this civil-rights action under 42
9 U.S.C. § 1983 to redress constitutional violations that he claims he suffered while
10 incarcerated. (ECF No. 1-1). Plaintiff is now released. On January 23, 2025, this
11 Court ordered Plaintiff to update his address by February 21, 2025. (ECF No. 7).
12 That deadline expired without an updated address from Plaintiff, and his mail
13 from the Court is being returned as undeliverable. (See ECF No. 8).

14 **I. DISCUSSION**

15 District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n
16 the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where
17 appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los*
18 *Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action based
19 on a party’s failure to obey a court order or comply with local rules. *See Carey v.*
20 *King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming dismissal for failure to
21 comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of
22 address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987)
23 (dismissal for failure to comply with court order). In determining whether to
24 dismiss an action on one of these grounds, the Court must consider: (1) the
25 public’s interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the Court’s need to
26 manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy
27 favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic
28 alternatives. *See In re Phenylpropanolamine Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 460 F.3d 1217,

1 1226 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting *Malone v. U.S. Postal Serv.*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th
2 Cir. 1987)).

3 The first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously resolving this
4 litigation and the Court's interest in managing its docket, weigh in favor of
5 dismissal of Plaintiff's claims. The third factor, risk of prejudice to defendants,
6 also weighs in favor of dismissal because a presumption of injury arises from the
7 occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing a pleading ordered by the court or
8 prosecuting an action. See *Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir.
9 1976). The fourth factor—the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their
10 merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors favoring dismissal.


11 The fifth factor requires the Court to consider whether less drastic
12 alternatives can be used to correct the party's failure that brought about the
13 Court's need to consider dismissal. See *Yourish v. Cal. Amplifier*, 191 F.3d 983,
14 992 (9th Cir. 1999) (explaining that considering less drastic alternatives *before*
15 the party has disobeyed a court order does not satisfy this factor); accord
16 *Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 643 & n.4 (9th Cir. 2002) (explaining that
17 “the persuasive force of” earlier Ninth Circuit cases that “implicitly accepted
18 pursuit of less drastic alternatives prior to disobedience of the court's order as
19 satisfying this element[,]” *i.e.*, like the “initial granting of leave to amend coupled
20 with the warning of dismissal for failure to comply[,]” have been “eroded” by
21 *Yourish*). Courts “need not exhaust every sanction short of dismissal before
22 finally dismissing a case, but must explore possible and meaningful
23 alternatives.” *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986).
24 Because this action cannot realistically proceed without the ability for the Court
25 and the defendants to send Plaintiff case-related documents, filings, and orders,
26 the only alternative is to enter a second order setting another deadline. But
27 without an updated address, the likelihood that the second order would even
28 reach Plaintiff is low, so issuing a second order will only delay the inevitable and

1 further squander the Court's finite resources. Setting another deadline is not a
2 meaningful alternative given these circumstances. So the fifth factor favors
3 dismissal.

4 **II. CONCLUSION**

5 Having thoroughly considered these dismissal factors, the Court finds that
6 they weigh in favor of dismissal. It is therefore ordered that this action is
7 dismissed without prejudice based on Plaintiff's failure to file an updated address
8 in compliance with this Court's January 23, 2025, order. The Clerk of Court is
9 directed to enter judgment accordingly and close this case. No other documents
10 may be filed in this now-closed case. If Plaintiff wishes to pursue his claims, he
11 must file a complaint in a new case and provide the Court with his current
12 address.

13
14 DATED: March 17, 2025

15
16
17 
18 ANNE R. TRAUM
19 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28